

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8 are pending in this application, of which claims 1-2 and 5-6 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner has objected to claim 1 for an informality which has been corrected in the aforementioned amendments.

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as unpatentable over **Koyanagi et al.** (previously applied).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Koyanagi et al. discloses a device and method to read bar-codes in which a ratio of a number of modules is compared to a reference module width character included in a bar-code. The number of modules is rounded up and off based upon the number of modules that includes the error component. When the error amount in the ratio exceeds a permissible value, the character in question is demodulated based on the resulting rounding up or off.

This is in contrast to the present invention, in which a single demodulation-pattern table is used for the demodulation. Accordingly, claims 1 and 5 have been amended to clarify this distinction and the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Watanabe et al.** (previously applied) in view of **Koyanagi et al.**

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Watanabe et al. discloses a method and device for reading a bar code which achieves an improved reading ratio or a reduced erroneous reading ratio in practical use by evaluating quantitatively the reliability of demodulation data and by performing a coincidence checking plural times only when a large error is recognized. When a reading distortion amount measured is within a predetermined allowable value, data extracted and demodulated from the bar code is judged to be valid, whereby the bar code reading is completed. When a reading distortion amount measured is not within the predetermined allowable value, if the same data from the bar code is extracted and demodulated continuously and at least twice, the same data extracted and demodulated from the bar code is judged to be valid, whereby the bar code reading is completed.

Watanabe et al. is directed to demodulation based on whether or not the measured reading distortion amount is within a predetermined allowable range, in contrast to the present invention, in which demodulation is based on a comparison of the number of modules detected to a predetermined number.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 2 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 2 and 6 have been so amended.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/nrp
Atty. Docket No. 031336
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE